

of mission assignments and the possible disintegration of the Muslim-Croat federation could compel us to extend our commitment in Bosnia. We are on a slippery slope toward a lengthy deployment of 5 or even 10 additional years.

Another issue that concerns me is the continued presence of Iranians in Bosnia who are training Bosnian Government soldiers. This is a clear violation of the Dayton peace agreement. Their presence also poses a threat to the safety of our troops, as some of these groups are opposed to our peace-keeping effort.

I commend Maj. Gen. William L. Nash, commander of the American sector of NATO forces in Bosnia, who stressed his determination to withdraw on schedule. He properly stated that the burden for peace is "on the shoulders of those folks that live here."

If the people of Bosnia truly want peace, 1 year is more than enough time to get it started.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the President to stick by the commitment and have our American troops home by Christmas.

Mr. Speaker, I ask to include a copy of my letter to the President in the RECORD at this point.

The letter referred to is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 28, 1996.

The PRESIDENT,  
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The March 21 edition of the New York Times reported the U.S. and NATO are being urged to keep our forces in Bosnia after the end of the year. International civilian and military authorities are alleged to be pressing for continued NATO presence beyond our scheduled departure.

To keep American troops in Bosnia past the announced date of departure at the end of 1996 would be a major mistake. First, it flies in the face of a clear statement by Secretary of State Warren Christopher: "This is not a permanent commitment. This is approximately a one-year commitment. . . . If it can't be done in a year, perhaps it can't be done in a longer period of time." Second, it breaks faith with our American troops who are presently stationed in Bosnia, who expect to return to their families in nine months. Third, it contradicts what the American people were told about the duration of the mission.

American forces are facing a difficult and challenging assignment in the NATO peace-keeping mission. The one-year deployment was intended to provide an opportunity for peace, not a guarantee of it. The people of Bosnia must assume the responsibility of ensuring their own peace.

Already, American and NATO peacekeepers are being diverted from their original mission to the task of rebuilding Bosnia. This assignment shifts the focus of our military forces from peacekeeping to assisting in civil projects.

Further, by several accounts, a cornerstone of the Dayton agreement—the continuance of the Muslim-Croat Federation—appears severely weakened. The U.S. and NATO could well be in a quandary if that alliance should crumble.

The push to keep U.S. and NATO forces in Bosnia, the expansion of mission assignments and the possible disintegration of the Muslim-Croat Federation could compel us to

extend our commitment in Bosnia. We are on a slippery slope toward a lengthy deployment of five or even ten additional years.

I commend Major General William L. Nash, Commander of the American sector of NATO forces in Bosnia, who stressed his determination to withdraw on schedule. He properly stated that the burden for peace is "on the shoulders of those folks that live here."

Mr. President, if the people of Bosnia truly want peace, one year is more than enough time to get it started.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,  
Member of Congress.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SHADEGG addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENE GREEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. SCHROEDER addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mrs. CUBIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. CUBIN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. NORWOOD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### THE CHILDREN'S TELEVISION ACT RULEMAKING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, in 1990 we passed in this body the Children's Television Act. In that act we set as a requirement that the Federal Communications Commission had to go into a rulemaking on the question of what the responsibilities of local broadcasters would be to have served the educational and informational needs of the children who live within the broadcast area of every television station in the United States. During the Bush years there was no real activity on this rulemaking that had to be undertaken, and there was a delay of almost a year before Reed Hunt was in fact confirmed as the new Chairman of the FCC in 1993.

The FCC is in a rulemaking right now on this issue, and it is I think about as important a debate as we can have in this country because, while the V-chip which we passed on the floor and is now law, as signed by President Clinton, gives to the parents of the country the ability to block out excessively violent, sexually material on their screen, and that will be a technology available to parents within the next couple of years, it still does not in any way ensure that there will be quality positive children's television that will enhance the educational and informational needs of children across the country. That is what the Children's Television Act rulemaking at the Federal Communications Commission is all about.

It is my belief that the Commission has to take a very strong stand on this issue. We know that children watch, on average, 4 to 7 hours of television every day. Now, would that it was not so, but we have moved from the 1950's in the era of "Leave It To Beaver" to the 1990's in the era of "Beavis and Butthead."

Increasingly, the broadcast stations in our country have reduced dramatically the amount of children's television of educational content that they put on the air, and instead, substituted the Flintstones or the Jetsons, and argued that in fact those are programs of educational quality because the Flintstones teach children about the archaeological age and the Jetsons will teach children about the future. But parents know that they really do not serve any educationally nutritious role in the development of young people's minds.

So this debate at the FCC is quite important. I am of the opinion that the FCC has to put on the books a requirement that a minimum of 3 hours per